North Central Regional Transit District
Board Meeting
Friday, August 7, 2009

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A regular monthly meeting of the North Central Regional Transit District Board was called to order on the above date at approximately 9:16 a.m. by Chairman Alfred Herrera at the New Mexico Municipal League, 1229 Paseo de Peralta, Santa Fe New Mexico.

a. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

b. MOMENT OF SILENCE

c. ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present:

City of Española Councilor Alfred Herrera, Chairman
Los Alamos County Mr. Tony Mortillaro
Rio Arriba County Commissioner Elias Coríz, Mr. Tomás Campos
Pojoaque Pueblo
San Ildefonso Pueblo Mr. Raymond Martínez, Mr. Bryan Martínez
Ohkay Owingeh
Santa Clara Pueblo Ms. Mary Lou Quintana, Mr. Edwin Tafoya
City of Santa Fe Councilor Rosemary Romero, Mr. Jon Bulthuis
Santa Fe County Commissioner Liz Stefanics, Mr. Andrew Jandáček
Tesuque Pueblo Governor Charlie Dorame
Taos County

Members Excused

Staff Members Present

Ms. Josette Lucero, Executive Director
Ms. Linda Trujillo, Regional Coordinator
Mr. Jack Valencia, Transit Project Manager
Ms. Cynthia Altheyab, Executive Assistant
Mr. Peter Dwyer, NCRTD Legal Counsel
Ms. Marjorie Kaplan, Financial Director
Mr. Patrick Nicholson, Transit Planner

Others Present

Mr. Greg White, NMDOT
Mr. David Harris, NMDOT
Mr. Carl Moore, Consultant
Ms. Jessie Lawrence, Consultant
Mr. Mike Davis, Los Alamos County
Ms. Carol Raymond, Santa Fe Trails Board
Ms. Mary Helen Follingstad, Santa Fe RPA Director

d. INTRODUCTIONS

Everyone present introduced themselves to the group.

e. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Mortillaro moved to approve the agenda as published. Commissioner Stefanics seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

f. APPROVAL OF BOARD MEETING MINUTES, June 5, 2009

Commissioner Stefanics moved to approve the minutes of June 5, 2009 as presented. Councilor Romero seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. NCRTD Board Meeting August 7, 2009 Page 3

g. APPROVAL OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES - May 20, 2009, June 19, 2009, June 29, 2009

Commissioner Stefanics moved approval of all three minutes of the special meetings. Councilor Romero seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

h. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING TRANSPORTATION ITEMS OR ISSUES

Mr. Greg White said he appreciated Councilor Herrera's help in getting the new facility in Española for parking. They were beginning improvements that were to be completed in early 2010.

Chairman Herrera thanked Mr. White for all of his work behind the scenes. He was pleased with moving forward with the land on Paseo de Oñate. It was close to a superfund site so there was some apprehension. This was an opportunity to do something with it.

Ms. Mary Lou Quintana arrived at this time.

Commissioner Stefanics asked about the liability in the DOT Park and Ride parking lots.

Mr. White said it was the user's individual liability. DOT waived liability.

Commissioner Coríz arrived at this time.

Commissioner Stefanics asked who the Taos County representatives were.

Ms. Lucero said Commissioner Barrone remained as the representative from Taos County.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 5 2009 RECONSIDERED

Councilor Romero went back to the June 5 minutes and requested a correction. Page 3, "Councilor Romero said she understood that the Governor, in coordination with Taos County, would make the appointment to the Commission and Commissioner Barrone would be the appointee to the NCRTD Board."

Councilor Romero moved to approve the minutes of June 5th as corrected on page 3 that the Governor would make the appointment of Mr. Barrone to the Commission and Commissioner Barrone would be appointed to the NCRTD

Board. Mr. Mortillaro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Tomás Campos arrived at this time.

2. APPROVAL ACTION ITEMS:

a. ELECT NCRTD VICE-CHAIR

Chairman Herrera asked for nominations.

Commissioner Stefanics nominated Councilor Romero to be Vice Chair. There were no other nominations.

Commissioner Stefanics moved to elect Councilor Romero as Vice Chair. Commissioner Coríz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Edwin Tafoya arrived at this time.

b. APPROVAL OF CURRENT PROPOSED SERVICE CHANGES

Ms. Lucero explained that Mr. Nicholson evaluated all the routes in place since October 2007. They were now moving into consolidation and coordination. The proposed changes went through the subcommittee and he was now reporting those changes. She distributed copies of the route map that showed the old routes.

• Peñasco Route

Mr. Nicholson reviewed the route changes, beginning with two routes in Taos County, one of which would be from Peñasco Route with up to six new stops proposed. Las Trampas, Rockwall, Pot Creek, Taos at Gusdorf & Roy, Taos @ Salazar & Berta, and Taos at the Kit Carson Coop. The three in Taos were already being served but he wanted to make them official.

Mr. Nicholson explained that the map was two years old and would be updated soon with the new routes.

He said they would look at a route with Chimayó in early fall.

Commissioner Coríz said he had requested a route to Chimayó, Cordova and Truchas since the RTD began and had yet to see it initiated. He had received many

calls asking for the service and had shared those with the Board.
Ms. Trujillo said there had been discussions on it and that route was to begin when GRT monies began to be received around October 1st.
Commissioner Coríz said he began requesting it four years ago before Taos was on the map, It was really disappointing and adding that route would improve the ridership by another 300-400.
Chairman Herrera agreed that Commissioner Coríz had brought it up before. He asked if there was anything on highway 76.
Ms. Trujillo said they had service into Chamisal from Peñasco. She said the costs for this route were not in the budget and to add it now would require some changes to other routes. She said that was a priority for when GRT monies were received along with Chama. It was just a matter of money at this point to fund these routes.
Chairman Herrera thought in light of the discussion here, that staff look at this route and see what could be done prior to October. It should be a high priority and thought it would be helpful even though it was just 3 months away.
Commissioner Stefanics asked if they did an analysis prior to a route for the number of riders in that route and then base it on a certain number of riders. She wondered on what basis a need was determined.
Ms. Lucero said they did an analysis and knew what the need expressed was. She said they got phone calls weekly.
Ms. Trujillo said the analysis was done in various ways and it was easier to study in urban areas. They got citizen petitions and she had one from Las Trampas and one from Truchas. The other way was when Board members asked for routes.
Commissioner Stefanics said they had a person doing demand response to get kids from schools and from the Department of Corrections to provide transit to the pen. She asked if they had some standardized way to get this done. There were lots of needs in the rural areas. But as a business, the Board probably should have some standards that all new routes must meet, whether it was demand response and then go to fixed route or begin with a fixed route. Maybe they were doing it informally and should get it into the service plan.
She asked when the service plan was going to be done so the Board could see how things were put in it.
Ms. Lucero said the Board had approved the first service plan with the grants they got with local sharing in July, 2007. Then they started researching GRT and planning for

new routes. So they began meeting with the member organizations to see what was desired to be included.
The second service plan was done in October 2008 and included what they wanted. Once the money kicked in, that was what they would do. The demand response was much more expensive and they could not change all the routes for one person.
Commissioner Stefanics clarified that her question was what the foundation for creating new routes was. If there were constituents along 76, it should become a fixed route. She asked if there was a way to deal with all of those and how they should be planning.
Ms. Lucero said most of them were started as demand response and turned it into fixed routes.
Ms. Mary Helen Follingstad arrived at this time.
Chairman Herrera thought the process was one that the Coordinating Committee should look at.
Ms. Lucero agreed.
Commissioner Stefanics suggested as an idea for the future that the Board might need to think about not a totally free service if GRT was very slow.
Councilor Romero welcomed Ms. Follingstad from the Santa Fe RPA. She noted that the RPA went a different route with a study they were in the midst of to get to a place of efficiency. The Corrections hours might not integrate with the current route times. The study results would become part of the RTD planning effort.
She said when they first started the retreats she had mentioned that the Board might have to revise its vision and might need to have a small fee for riding. The lower GRT revenues would affect everyone and the Board needed to be efficient in spending that money. She asked how they should look at these routes. She hoped the Coordinating Committee (on which Mr. Bulthuis sat and had plenty of experience) could bring back solid recommendations.
Commissioner Coríz yielded to Mr. Campos.
Mr. Campos said Rio Arriba County's frustration was that the Velarde route and the El Rito routes were requested at the same time as the Truchas route.
Commissioner Coríz said he had shared this many times with Ms. Trujillo, way before any of this here. It led into Española and would improve the RTD. He hoped they could get it done.

Ms. Trujillo said she would be glad to reprioritize the routes. The Chama route was placed above Route 76 in priority. We would be glad to meet with Rio Arriba County and maybe cut Chama in favor of this route. The changes today would involve no monetary changes.
Commissioner Coríz said the numbers would justify this route. He asked that it just get it done.
Chairman Herrera felt the policy of the Board was important. When the money started flowing, they would have to be in a give and take situation. When the service plan was first discussed, the consultant was talking about $20 million and now it would be less. He questioned if the public even knew what process they needed to follow to request service. There needed to be a mechanism and advertising so this was a good discussion.
Chairman Herrera welcomed Mr. Edwin Tafoya from Santa Clara and Mr. Campos from Rio Arriba County who had come in earlier.
Mr. Tafoya recognized the work of staff for establishing the routes and then reporting to the Board at the next meeting the results of the committee's work.
Mr. Tafoya moved to establish the route from Chimayó in the NCRTD routes. Commissioner Stefanics seconded the motion.
Councilor Romero thought the motion was actually contrary to the earlier discussion on the process of going through the Committee. She said she was affirming the committee process to consider it and bring it back to the full Board. The Committee meetings were open to the full Board to attend.
Commissioner Stefanics said she would have no problem with an amendment that the Coordinating Committee consider this and bring a recommendation back to the Board. Mr. Tafoya agreed that was his intent.
Commissioner Coríz felt the motion was in order because it was going to happen.
Mr. Mortillaro asked that the motion be restated.
Mr. Tafoya said his motion was to have staff take the request to the Coordinating Committee to consider a bus route on Route 76 and bring back their recommendation to the Board.
Ms. Trujillo asked if this would be a full study including a survey of potential riders.

Chairman Herrera thought it would be the process they had been using.
Governor Dorame said with all due respect to Mr. Tafoya that there was a need for urgency here to designate this area as a priority. This discussion should be about action, not a study. It should not go back to square one. He agreed with Commissioner Coríz about the need there.
Chairman Herrera thought urgency was a part of the motion.
The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Councilor Romero who voted against the motion.
Commissioner Stefanics moved to request staff to prepare a written process for the Coordinating Committee to review at its next meeting. Commissioner Coríz seconded the motion.
Mr. Mortillaro asked for some clarification that the motion was for determining routes to be considered. Commissioner Stefanics agreed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
Commissioner Stefanics moved to approve the Peñasco route schedule. Councilor Romero seconded the motion.
Governor Dorame asked who the contact was at Picuris.
Ms. Trujillo said they had an individual there for about a year now as an authorized contact.
Governor Dorame said he would like to contact people there to meet with staff.
Chairman Herrera thanked him for the offer
The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
Questa Route -
Mr. Nicholson said these were no cost extensions to the route. San Cristobal was a proposed stop and Civic Plaza Drive.
Commissioner Stefanics did not think one hour was sufficient for shopping at Walmart.

Ms. Trujillo explained that it was a small Walmart. They had used this schedule for about 6-8 months and found it was sufficient. The passengers could not bring more than two packages on the bus. It was more of an outing for the seniors.
Mr. Campos saw no reason not to pass them but asked if they had been run by the representatives from Taos.
Mr. Nicholson said he met with the Taos County delegation and the County Manager on this proposal.
Chairman Herrera was trying to envision some standardization. He asked what they needed to do as a Board to establish some uniform coordination with other entities. If Park and Ride decided to change their schedule was a good example.
Mr. Harris wondered if a quarterly coordination meeting among all the entities including those by conference call would help with the coordination. If the Board liked the idea, people could participate as needed.
Chairman Herrera thought that was an excellent idea and would contribute to the coordination.
Mr. Mortillaro agreed it would be good.
Mr. Mortillaro moved to approve the Questa route schedule as amended. Commissioner Stefanics seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

c. APPROVAL OF FINAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

Ms. Kaplan briefly explained the budget submission to DFA. There was one change since the last meeting - that they would get no 5311 money. So the only difference in this budget was to separate that out and reduces total federal grant and the local match. If the Board still wanted to purchase those items, they would have to find another source. $187,500 was the expected amount from DOT. The difference was noted on page 3 in the footnote. It would provide a little more GRT since the NCRTD wouldn't have to match those federal funds it didn't receive.
Mr. Mortillaro confirmed that Ms. Kaplan presented this to the Finance Committee and they discussed it. This report supported the Committee's recommendation.
Mr. Mortillaro moved to approve the Final Budget as presented. Councilor Romero seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. NCRTD Board Meeting August 7, 2009 Page 10

d. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2009-11 – 2009-2010 FINAL BUDGET

Chairman Herrera asked if there was any feedback from DFA regarding the preliminary budget.

Ms. Kaplan said DFA said it was fine and allowed the Board to approve it today.

Mr. Mortillaro moved to approve Resolution 2009-11 as presented. Commissioner Stefanics seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. [Commissioner Coríz and Mr. Campos were not in room at the time of the vote.]

e. APPROVAL OF FIRST AMENDMENT TO MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN LOS ALAMOS COUNTY AND NCRTD

Ms. Lucero referred to the memo in the Board packet and explained that as part of the purchase of the building for maintenance and operations the NCRTD needed to have bridge funding in order to get the DOT monies. She said Commissioner Stefanics agreed to approach Santa Fe County for help and Los Alamos County graciously agreed to help the NCRTD once again. Mr. Dwyer was working on a contract to allow the money to be advanced by Los Alamos County before the closing date on October 1st.

Chairman Herrera said he had been kept up to date on the staff work on the building and commended everyone involved in it. They did an amazing job including the bridge funding. The stimulus money required up front money for entities such as the NCRTD and the Board really appreciated the help.

Mr. Dwyer addressed the memo, saying it was best to do an MOU. He drafted it yesterday and tried to contact the Los Alamos attorneys but was not able to do so. So he asked the Board for conceptual approval on it, subject to their approval. The process had been pushed ahead rapidly. They have not had a chance to review it but it could not be avoided. So once their attorney signed it, it would be approved.

Ms. Lucero said the agreement was for $880,000 in order that they could purchase the building prior to October 1.

Chairman Herrera wanted to entertain a motion based on Mr. Dwyer's comments. And authorize Ms. Lucero to execute the paperwork.

Commissioner Stefanics moved that the MOU be conceptually approved so that the attorneys could work together and to authorize Ms. Lucero to execute it

notwithstanding any major policy changes. Councilor Romero seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Stefanics asked if the Finance Committee had considered whether an open line of credit at a bank would be appropriate for future needs.

Ms. Kaplan said they did but there were some restrictions on what public entities could incur. The Finance Committee could bring the matter to a future meeting.

Mr. Dwyer explained that state and local governments were prohibited by the constitution from borrowing money and were limited to the bonding process. It was not impossible but was constitutionally challenging. It was not as simple as just going to the bank.

Commissioner Stefanics asked if the NCRTD was governmental or quasi governmental.

Mr. Dwyer said it was fully governmental, basically the same as a city.

Chairman Herrera agreed the Finance Committee would be the proper entity to look at it and suggested they might work with the legislature or the Governor's office at the options possible. It could be an issue and should be addressed at the state level.

Commissioner Stefanics agreed and commented that it might already be that the DFA had made a provision for loans and credit.

Mr. Dwyer said they might have but the open line of credit was not an option available. He added that it would probably be for a period of about three weeks and he was not aware of any structure for that.

Chairman Herrera said to Mr. White and Mr. Harris that any help they could provide for a quick reimbursement would be very appreciated.

Mr. Mortillaro emphasized that also because by October Los Alamos County must use those funds.

Ms. Lucero said she had been in contact with DOT on reimbursement. They were assuring a quick turnaround even though there had been problems with the SHARE program.

Mr. Harris said as long as everything was in line, he could walk it through and give it special attention. Hopefully in another week or two they could execute that grant and get the contract finished for the $2 million. Once that was in place, they would cross their fingers that SHARE would process it.

Chairman Herrera noted there were to be two reimbursements and asked what the second one was.
Mr. Dwyer said it was in the packet and was the resolution in the public hearing. The first one was for the front part of the property and the second part was $830,000 for the back part. They would first acquire the front property and the building at closing and then have a second closing for the second piece.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

CONSIDERATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2009-10 RATIFYING PURCHASE OF REAL PROPERTY – 1327 North Riverside, Black Mesa Estates Subdivision

Chairman Herrera asked for public comment on Resolution 2009-10.
These were no speakers from the public regarding this matter.
Ms. Lucero reviewed the steps that had been taken and hoped they would be in the renovated building by next summer.
Mr. Jandáček arrived at this time.
Mr. Dwyer said there was no real process for this but they would emulate what a city would do on it just to be professional about it. The memo found that the price was good and the property useful to the RTD and that it was in the public interest to make the purchase.
The closing was scheduled for the 17th with two payments to the seller. They interviewed two potential architects last week and would interview two more next week. So if the resolution passed, they would make sure that due diligence had been completed and executed by the 17th.
Mr. Dwyer said in the negotiations the seller wanted a small portion of the property. They did not agree to the price but the Board refused so the back property size was slightly reduced. They would reserve a small sliver of land on the east end. They had to get the lot split done and convey the rest to the NCRTD.
Mr. Valencia said they were able to get the Environmental Assessment done and supplied that in the submission to FTA. The NMDOT had been provided that information also.
Chairman Herrera closed the public hearing to entertain Board comments.

Councilor Romero moved to approve Resolution 2009-10 as presented authorizing the purchase of real property. Commissioner Stefanics seconded the motion.

Mr. Mortillaro asked what the appraised value was.

Mr. Valencia said the appraisal was pending and being reviewed by FTA. Two were done on the building. One was at $1.2 million and the other at $1.3 million. So it was favorable to the $865,000 purchase price. The structural engineer brought a positive report also.

Ms. Lucero clarified that the appraisal value of $1.2 million was just for the building.

Mr. Valencia said there would be a zone change from residential to commercial use and it would then appraise at a higher amount.

Mr. Dwyer said he was not an appraiser. They hired Don Wiviott as broker and Mitch Davenport as project manager and both of them assured him it was favorable to the NCRTD. Because of the dive in the economy, the banks had a different approach on appraisals. Currently the appraisers were agreeing that the purchase price was the value of the land. It was because the industry had been under extreme pressure to appraise conservatively.

Mr. Valencia clarified that with the reduction in size for the easement they would have 8.35 acres.

Mr. Mortillaro said there was a business operating in the building and asked what would become of that business.

Ms. Lucero said they had moved out already.

Chairman Herrera asked about the ATM on the property.

Ms. Lucero said they would keep the ATM. It generated money for the property owner and was a very popular ATM.

Councilor Romero asked if the appraisal on both properties was for the categorical exclusion he went through.

Mr. Valencia said the appraisal was submitted as one project site.

Councilor Romero asked if it wasn't two different zones.

Mr. Valencia agreed. The environmental consultant analyzed both lots and submitted with their categorical exclusions and DOT was given a copy of it.

Mr. Mortillaro asked if the back property was appraised on residential zoning.
Mr. Valencia said it was currently being appraised as commercial. Matt Pendleton was the appraiser.
Mr. Mortillaro asked if it had to go through the Española Planning Department for the change in zoning.
Mr. Dwyer agreed and the current owners were going to do all the leg work.
Mr. Mortillaro asked what they would do if it was not approved.
Mr. Dwyer said the Board would have the option of canceling or going ahead. He said it would be better to have the appraiser here to tell the Board it was a good deal but there was none present. They were achieving their objectives and keeping the price down. The acreage was there so whether residential or commercial, it was a good deal.
Councilor Romero was a little concerned that they were dependent on the rezone. She asked what their General Plan looked like.
Mr. Valencia said he understood and that was why they created sequentially closures just in case. They would have a building and 1.3 acres and could then decide on the rest. It might not be totally sufficient for all their vehicles but they could require the seller to meet those requirements.
Mr. Dwyer added that the back property was done like a PUD with a MP that covered all the uses and the zoning. That was the approach taken and it already had a mixed use there. So it was not an insurmountable problem. Extending the commercial zoning should not be a problem and there were not too many reasons why anyone would object. They could report back, if the Board wanted.
Commissioner Stefanics said the discussion about zoning concerned her. She thought they wanted both pieces; not just one. If the rezoning didn't occur, she had hesitation about the front piece. It was to set up their future.
Mr. Dwyer said the seller already agreed to do it. The risk was upon them to make it happen.
Commissioner Stefanics said this whole property would take care both of current and future needs but the front property only would not.
Mr. Dwyer said the offer was contingent upon the rezoning being approved. So it was all one thing but it was staged in two phases.

Commissioner Stefanics said she had no desire to purchase a commercial and a residential.
Commissioner Coríz thought they could all support the proposed site and a decision would be made. He had asked for some information from Ms. Lucero and through Mr. Campos to give him a status on what took the Board to this point. He did not get the information but just an email outline. He wanted to go on record on not questioning the appraisal validity.
He thanked DOT for their help. They were moving along on the county property. They would have a school on that site and infrastructure in place and would have the environment clearance before Dec 1 2009.
He noted that this property was appraised at $500,000 a few years ago and the property had been vacant for 4-5 years. So he wanted to know how from that time until now, it could now be appraised at $1.2 million and wanted to know how they went about appraising this property. He felt they owed it to the taxpayer that they were making decision based on sound information.
Mr. Valencia clarified that the requirements of the FTA prohibited their purchase without a justified appraisal. If they did not have one, they would not purchase. The earnest money was refundable. He had no knowledge about the difference in appraisals but would check it out.
Commissioner Coríz wanted to make sure when they signed it that it was in the public interest and to make sure those numbers were where they wanted to be.
Mr. Dwyer said that was what this resolution was all about.
Mr. Valencia added that the RTD was not paying the fees for the realtor. Those would be paid by the seller. Secondly, the appraisal would show the comparables in the areas. The comparables in that area were significantly higher. They did discuss that the building itself was initially appraised at $1.2 million. A party from Nevada purchased it and it had been repossessed.
Ms. Lucero said the appraisal was due by Thursday in their office.
Mr. Tafoya asked what kind of appraisal they were getting on the back part.
Mr. Valencia said the contract put the responsibility on the seller to make the zoning change and it would be appraised at commercial values, even though they had an agreed upon purchase price. They would have two closings - first on the building and second on the back land. They wouldn't close until the zone was changed.
Mr. Dwyer said the Board could unravel the deal if needed. The offers were a

binding contract and there were lots of things contingent upon the seller. He understood the reservations. Maybe they needed to come back when they had more information but they were trying to meet the needs of others like DOT to have the money spent in a timely manner.
Mr. Valencia agreed. They had a grant with a drop dead date and also had a county grant with an expiration date so there were a lot of monies made available to get the NCRTD to this juncture.
Mr. Dwyer clarified that the prices agreed upon were contingent on having both properties available - the first check would go into escrow and sit there pending the second closing up to 60 days. If it didn't happen, the escrow check was given back to NCRTD and the deed back to the seller.
Mr. Mortillaro said that reassured him. His second question was on lot line adjustment. He asked if that was an administrative action.
Mr. Valencia understood that was an administrative action.
Mr. Dwyer said they could approve the lot line adjustment but the MP showed residential development on it so the MP would have to be approved with the change.
Commissioner Stefanics - asked for an amendment on page one at bottom on #1 to add "based on commercial zoning" and on #3 by adding "based on completing the zoning."
Councilor Romero agreed the amendment was friendly.
Mr. White said it needed to include the change in the general plan as well. It would be worth including in the proposed amendment.
Councilor Romero said that it would be friendly to her to include that the zoning be in agreement with the designation of the current City of Española General Plan.
Commissioner Stefanics said she would be fine with that as long as it was understood that this was another way to stop the purchase.
Mr. Dwyer said it was all contingent upon approval of this Board. He thought they already understood this and intended to comply with these conditions.
Chairman Herrera said about the Rio Arriba County property that this Board and the staff were very grateful for everything Rio Arriba County had done up to this point regarding the property they made available. It was actually the events that ended up for

the Board's choice. Rio Arriba had been a strong player, just by their willingness to have the RTD housed at their facility. He also wanted to make it clear that in no way was the Board's action spiteful to that idea. It was just an evaluation of what they wanted to do as a Board and they had a one-time shot. So there were lots of things that happened. They didn't want to come back to the community and say that they couldn't agree on spending $2 million dollars.

Commissioner Coríz thanked the Board for their work collectively. They talked about the property and looked at some of the benefits that location would have and the County was committed 100% to the RTD on this. After reviewing all the information, they were still on board and willing to support the RTD. They were not pulling out their leadership.

Mr. Valencia said with their current schedule, they could be in the building in late spring or early summer.

The motion to approve the Resolution 2009-10 as amended to purchase real property passed by unanimous roll call vote with the City of Española, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, the City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County and Tesuque Pueblo all voting in the affirmative and none voting against. (No elected representative from Los Alamos County was present.)

Mr. Valencia tallied the votes as 19 votes in favor so it met 2/3 majority, even though only a simple majority was required.

Chairman Herrera thanked the Board and the staff. This was a tremendous milestone for the organization. He also thanked the DOT.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a. FINANCE AND PERSONNEL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT – Anthony Mortillaro

Mr. Mortillaro said with the current discussions they had taken care of what this Subcommittee had to report.

b. TRIBAL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT – Jack Valencia

Mr. Valencia said they elected a chairman, Mr. Tim Vigil from Pojoaque Pueblo, at the last meeting. He said they had submitted proposals for two different grants. One of the requests was that the tribes be in interaction with the RPA. Chairman Vigil requested that the RPA meet with the tribal subcommittee to make sure they had

input prior to the recommendation being presented.
Commissioner Stefanics said she would convey that to Ms. Follingstad. The final report was coming to the group at the end of August. There might have to be a separate conference call set up to make sure there was input. There was going to be an Aug 31 report prepared. We would make sure that action happened with the tribal entities.

c. REGIONAL COORDINATION AND CONSOLIDATION SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT – Liz Stefanics

Commissioner Stefanics noted a needed correction in the Committee minutes - Mr. Jandáček was from Santa Fe County, not the City of Santa Fe. She also requested summary minutes instead of verbatim.
Ms. Lucero said there were different people requesting these minutes.
Commissioner Stefanics said they had already recommended a couple of items for their next agenda. They were always looking for more members.

d. EXECUTIVE UPDATE – Josette Lucero

Ms. Lucero noted there were two monthly reports in the Board packet. They were looking at all existing routes and she was glad to hear the Board wanted a procedure for adding routes. She agreed to would look into some standards on it.
Councilor Romero announced that Mr. Bulthuis had said there were some shelters in storage and it would be good to have Mr. Nicholson work with him on it.
She thanked Ms. Altheyab for making the attachments easy to access.
Chairman Herrera also thanked Ms. Altheyab.
Ms. Lucero said they were getting ready to submit applications to DOT for vehicles. She handed out a memo on it.
Ms. Trujillo said the application was due by August 17th. She asked Commissioner Stefanics what type of vehicle they needed.
Commissioner Stefanics agreed to find out.

e. NCRTD RIDERSHIP REPORT – Josette Lucero

Ms. Trujillo reported that in general, ridership was going up.
There were no questions about the report.

f. NCRTD FINANCIAL REPORT – Marjorie Kaplan

Ms. Kaplan said she had nothing else to report.

g. STATUS OF NEW ACCOUNTING SOFTWARE – Marjorie Kaplan

Ms. Kaplan said she and her assistant went to Albuquerque to meet with the software consultant. They were running in parallel for this quarter and would use only the new software starting October 1. The report formats might be changing and she asked Board members to let her know any requests for customizing reports. She explained that REDW Technology in Albuquerque was the vendor and offered full support. The consultant was particularly responsive.

Chairman Herrera asked for one more agenda item to be considered prior to the retreat.

7. NEXT BOARD MEETING DATE

After a brief discussion, the Board agreed to schedule the September Board meeting on September 11th instead of the 4th.

The Board took a brief recess for refreshments prior to the beginning of the retreat portion.

RETREAT

Mr. Moore announced this was the wrap up session and handed out a summary to go through.

The first page was a time line that reminded everyone of their work. They interviewed individual members in February and then came to the Board with results of that on the role of members and the vision, etc.

At the February meeting they had a good discussion clarifying roles and began to

work on the rules needed for direction.
The Board charged a small subcommittee to take those ideas and put them into usable format. At the March meeting the Board refined it further. Out of that they created ground rules.
In April the consultants came with thoughts on the service plan and in May decided not to come back to the Board but to meet with every entity on the Board individually to go over the ground rules and test performance measures.
At the June meeting they brought back those measurements. They did not meet in July and today wanted to finish that work.
Mr. Moore began to go through the proposed ground rules that were pending Board approval. The members took a few minutes to read through all of it and would then raise any concerns or questions. In each section, Mr. Moore worked toward a consensus of the Board.
Purpose was okay. Constraints - Majority Approval and Consensus Building were added as constraints. The Roles section was okay.
Participation/Membership/Representation/Composition: The Board discussed allowing or permitting other members to join and how large the Board membership should be. An important issue was what adding new members would do to the voting strength analysis.
The members also discussed the confusion about who could vote at the meeting and under what conditions the alternate or designee was allowed to vote. It also concerned the financial assessments made upon each member.
In the discussion, the Board agreed that elected representatives did not need to yield the floor to the designee and that the Chair could recognize either one to speak.
It was also clarified that a member was absent when neither the elected representative nor the designee were present at a Board meeting. The absence was unexcused unless the entity had requested an excused absence before the meeting date.
There was an extended discussion about the membership questions including whether all members needed to have a board membership and what their local match requirements would be.
The consensus was that the Regional Coordination and Consolidation subcommittee should tackle this issue and bring back a recommendation to the Board.

Councilor Romero proposed that Outreach was needed as a category in addition to Communication.
Commissioner Stefanics referred to the second paragraph of Communications about suggesting agenda items. She said staff were not sending out the 15 day notice on agenda items. Nor was the Board considering future agenda items.
Under the Board Meetings discussion, the consensus was to officially establish an Executive Committee for handling business between Board meetings.
Under Ground Rules, there was a consensus that from time to time a caucus break or discussion break might be needed in the course of a Board meeting for conferring with colleagues.
Under Decision-making, Mr. Valencia and Ms. Lucero explained the formula that was used in the voting strength analysis (based on population size).
There were no comments on the Media section.
There was a discussion on the DOT standards that unfairly compared the large geography of the NCRTD with the demographics of the City of Belen that caused the RTD to lose money from federal and state sources.
Mr. Valencia noted that the Rural Transit Department at the federal level was beginning to recognize the geographic factor and a public comment period was at hand.
Mr. Moore agreed to provide notes back to the Board from this discussion. The Board now needed to do the conversion work based on the deliberations from all the retreat sessions.
Chairman Herrera thanked both of them very much for all their help.

5. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

None.

6. MISCELLANEOUS

None.

7. NEXT BOARD MEETING: Friday, September 11, 2009

8. ADJOURN

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Approved by:

Alfred Herrera, Chairman

Attest:

Michael Wismer, Secretary-Treasurer

Minutes submitted by: